

REMARKS

These remarks are responsive to the non-final Office Action of May 26, 2009.

Claims 1, 2, 3, 13, 68, and 69 have been amended. No new matter has been entered. Claims 1-5, 8, 13-16 and 52-82 remain pending in this application. Reconsideration and allowance of the instant application are respectfully requested.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §112, Second Paragraph

Claims 1-5, 8, 13-16, and 52-67 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph. Applicants have amended claims 1 and 13 to overcome the Examiner's rejection. Claims 68 and 69 have been likewise amended.

Dependent claims 2-5, 8, 14-16, and 52-67 have overcome this rejection by the fact they are dependent on amended claims 1 and 13.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over Kluss in view of Carroll

Claims 1-5, 8, 13-16, 52-75, and 77-82 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kluss in view of Carroll. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claim 1 as amended recites:

said server including a storage configured to store templates of electronic booking requests and provide one of said templates based on a search of templates performed by said user, said electronic booking request received over the third communication pathway having been created from one of said stored templates, ...

This recitation is based, in part, on claim 3 as previously presented. In rejecting claim 3, the Examiner did not give patentable weight to various recitations. The recitations now included in claim 1 are affirmatively set forth as the templates and the providing of the templates based on a search for the templates.

Kluss fails to suggest the storage of templates and the ability of the server to provide a search capability to the user and serving the resultant template. Carroll also fails to suggest this recitation of claim 1.

With respect to claims 2 and 3, one of the aspects of the templates now added into claim 1 is the ability to minimize data entry for similar shipments. In this regard, claims 2 and 3 further define how these templates are used. As the combination fails to suggest templates as now defined in claims 2 and 3, these claims are allowable at least as being dependent on claim 1.

Claims 13, 68, and 69 have been similarly amended to affirmatively recite the storage of templates by the server. Each of these claims is allowable over Kluss and Carroll for at least the reasons associated with claim 1 above.

Dependent claims 4-5, 8, 14-16, 52-67, 70-75, and 77-82 are allowable at least as being dependent on an allowable independent claim.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over Kluss in view of Carroll and Guidice

Claim 76 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kluss in view of Carroll in further view of Guidice. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Guidice fails to provide the teachings missing from the combination of Kluss and Carroll. Accordingly, claim 76 is allowable at least as being dependent on allowable claim 69.

All rejections having been addressed, Applicants respectfully submit that the instant application is in condition for allowance, and respectfully solicits prompt notification of the same. However, if for any reason the Examiner believes the application is not in condition for allowance or there are any questions, the examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at (202) 824-3184.

Respectfully submitted,
BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.

1100 13th Street, N.W.
Suite 1200
Washington, D.C. 20005-4051

By: /Christopher R. Glembocki/
Christopher R. Glembocki
Reg. No. 38,800

Dated: November 27, 2009